#### **DESIGN REVIEW BOARD - MINUTES**

CITY CONFERENCE ROOM 107 May 24, 2007: 4:00 P.M.

## 1A. Roll Call.

Members present: Bostater, Lynch, Millikin, Nelson & Perney

Members absent: Hamman, Renz

Department staff: Burger, Klima

1B. Introduction of Guests.

Rick Affholder, Dennis Collier & Ken Wasserman

1C. Additions or corrections to the agenda.

None.

1D. Minutes of January 25, 2007.

Motion to accept minutes as presented approved (4-0).

2. Old Business:

None.

#### 3. New Business:

3A. Application #CC07-2, filed by Norton, Wasserman, Jones & Kelly LLC, 213 S. Santa Fe, requesting the approval of a certificate of compatibility to allow the renovation of an existing storefront and the construction of an arcade canopy over the front entrance to the building located at 213 S. Santa Fe. The subject property is legally described as Lot 143 & N. ½ of Lot 145 on Santa Fe Avenue in the Original Town of Salina and is addressed as 213 S. Santa Fe Avenue.

Mr. Burger presented the staff report on the proposed project as it is contained in the case file.

Ms. Perney asked Mr. Wasserman do you have anything you would like to add to John's report.

Mr. Wasserman stated probably nothing to add. John did a good job of describing what it is we are planning. When we designed this we were trying to be consistent with what has already happened on the Block, at the First Bank Kansas and at Gary Stansberry's building. Gary and I had talked. If this goes through he wanted to do some things with the outside of his building as well. So we're

trying to make it consistent and give us in terms of the office a more recognizable entrance. Nowadays, people drive around the block 3 or 4 times trying to figure out where it is we are. This could help that a lot.

Ms. Perney stated I know your building. Is it painted a dark red on the stucco?

Mr. Wasserman stated yes a "Dusty Rose" color I think it is.

Ms. Perney asked are you going to maintain that color or change that to another color and what will be the color of the metal siding and this canopy façade?

Mr. Wasserman stated the metal siding and standing seam roof will be the same color that they are today. We're adding onto the siding that is already there above the metal mansard awning. That color will stay and match that metal on the roof line and on the canopy roof. The front face of the canopy will be the light beige color that is there now on the stucco storefront with the darker red.

Ms. Perney asked would it be almost the same color as the building north of you?

Mr. Wasserman stated that is a white or concrete color. It will be similar to the stucco color scheme that is there on our façade now. The front pillars on the canopy will have a white finish.

Ms. Perney asked are there any more questions or comments from the Board?

Ms. Lynch stated I think it is an improvement on the general appearance of the building. I believe that it will be a very nice feature on the storefront once it is there.

Mr. Bostater stated I think that if this were on any other block in the Downtown, I would not like it nearly as much, but on this particular block, it will be a nice addition.

Mr. Nelson stated I think that it was a compatible improvement based upon the materials and design of the storefront and I would support the proposed project.

Ms. Perney stated I would agree with Mike. As I drove down the street, I realized there were other canopies and arcades that extend out from their buildings. When I first read the report, I thought that this wasn't what we've been approving in the Downtown. Seeing where it would go I thought maybe that will fit in with all those contemporary buildings. First Bank Kansas and the Shaver building both have canopies out above the sidewalk. Is there any other comments? Hearing none, do I have a motion?

Design Review Board Minutes May 24, 2007 Page 3

MOTION: Mr. Millikin stated I move that we approve Application #CC07-2 as it has

been presented by staff.

SECOND: Ms. Lynch seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion approved 5-0.

3B. Application #CC07-3, filed by Rick Affholder, 100 N. Santa Fe, requesting the approval of a certificate of compatibility to remove an existing canopy and to erect new fabric awnings on the front façade of the building located at 104 N. Santa Fe Avenue. The subject property is legally described as Lot 105 and the North one-half (1/2) of Lot 107 on Santa Fe, Original Town of Salina and is addressed as 104 N. Santa Fe Avenue.

Mr. Burger presented the staff report for the proposed project as it is contained in the case file.

Ms. Perney asked are there any questions or comments by the Board? Would the applicant wish to add anything to Mr. Burger's report?

Mr. Affholder, 2632 Deborah, stated I think that this project would add greatly to the Downtown area. Mr. Collier, the owner, also wants to put up accent lights in the brick area between each of the display windows. A total of 7 accent lights will be placed between the windows and doors. The lights would illuminate the sidewalk and lower storefront making them more secure. This would also add to the beautification of the building.

Mr. Collier, 4209 E. Country Club Road, stated the accent lights were originally in the architect's drawings for the renovation of the building in 1974, although they weren't put on the outside of the building. They will be located between the brick piers. They were originally planned to be a half-round accent light. It was in the original architectural drawings, and a permit was issued for these. They were just never installed on the building. I proposed that we put those on the building as originally planned. It is quite dark beneath the canopy that is there at night and sometimes it is associated with some of the bar activity outdoors just down the street. It will greatly enhance the building to light up this area. Darkness tends to attract certain kinds of activities that we would like to avoid there.

Ms. Perney asked is the wiring already there for the lights?

Mr. Collier stated the conduit is already there. They didn't drill through the brick. Jeff Castle is our electrical contractor who will install the lights if they are approved. This was on the original plans when Mr. Warden renovated the façade in the 1970's. They are round accent lights that would go there where you see the decorative brick patterns on the storefront now. They would light the areas in

between the display windows and new awnings. Also, where the stairs are there to the right, that doesn't currently have a light at the street. We'd also like to install a light for security there. Not a bright one, but one that would generally light up that entrance.

Ms. Perney asked would you have any lights where the entrance is recessed from the façade.

Mr. Collier stated there are two glass display windows on each side that face that vestibule area and the lights from the display windows have lit that area in the past. I've talked with the electrician on how to light up that area. There is an arcade sign that comes out below the awning. We would not reuse that. Our plan is to install an additional down light in that area to illuminate that front entrance vestibule.

Mr. Nelson asked what color are the awnings going to be? Our staff report states that they will be black. Would they have any accent colors or borders?

Mr. Affholder stated they will all be black. We were discussing either black or a deep maroon color for the fabric. We haven't made up our mind on that. It will be the kind of fabric awning that you see elsewhere on this block. They will be domed or semi-circled as they are shown in the report.

Ms. Perney asked you have several signs on awning valances at Sentimental Journey next door. Will you be planning to add those types of signs on the new awnings? Are you considering that?

Mr. Affholder stated we haven't completely decided what type of signage will go on the new building. There will probably be an awning sign on the main awning over the entrance. We haven't developed plans yet for that.

Mr. Burger stated that the applicants will have to submit an additional application when they decide upon a sign design. If only an awning sign and window signage are to be used, then this would not necessarily come back before this Board. If a new wall sign or a sign at the rear entrance to the building is later proposed, then this would come back before this Board.

MOTION: Mr. Nelson moved to accept Application #CC07-3 as it is presented in the staff

report.

SECOND: Mr. Bostater seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion approved 5-0.

### 4. Election of Officers.

Ms. Perney stated before you is the staff report detailing our last election of officers. This item should have been scheduled for the September 2006 meeting but we somehow overlooked it.

Mr. Burger stated we did not have sufficient members available at our January 25, 2007 meeting to hold elections then so we postponed elections until this meeting. Ms. Perney and Mr. Millikin each have served two consecutive one-year terms as Chair and Vice-Chair so they would be ineligible to serve as Chair or Vice-Chair. The officers that will be elected today would serve until our September 13, 2007 meeting. Another election of officers will take place at our annual meeting. I've noted those three members whose appointments will expire on August 31<sup>st</sup>. Each would be eligible for reappointment to this Board.

Ms. Perney stated that there are likely other members on this Board who may agree to serve. The floor is now open for nominations.

Ms. Lynch asked has Bob served on this Board before?

Ms. Perney stated that Bob has had a long history with this Board. He served for two terms then was off the Board for a while. I know he was Chair on this Board when I came on.

Mr. Nelson stated that this is my third meeting and we haven't met regularly for a while so I would like to have some more time and experience before I would volunteer to serve as an officer. After a while I think I would be more comfortable and willing to serve as an officer.

Ms. Lynch stated I would be a little hesitant to try to serve at this point. II believe that Bob would be a good choice.

Ms. Perney asked do I have any nominations for Chair at this time?

MOTION: Ms. Lynch stated I would move to nominate Bob Hamman for Chair.

SECOND: Mr. Nelson seconded the motion.

Ms. Perney asked do we have any additional nominations? Hearing none do I have a motion to close the nominations?

Mr. Bostater moved to close the nominations.

VOTE: Motion approved 5-0 to elect Bob Hamman as Design Review Board Chair.

Design Review Board Minutes May 24, 2007 Page 6

Ms. Perney asked do I have any nominations for Vice-Chair at this time?

MOTION: Ms. Lynch stated I would nominate Mike Bostater for Vice-Chair.

SECOND: Mr. Millikin seconded the motion.

Ms. Perney asked do we have any additional nominations? Hearing none, do I have a motion that the nominations cease?

Mr. Millikin moved to close the nominations.

VOTE: Motion approved 4-0, 1 Abstention to elect Mike Bostater as Design Review Board Vice-Chair.

#### 5. Other Matters.

Mr. Burger stated that I want to let you know that the masonry repair down at the Stiefel Theatre that you may have noticed is being done by Mid-Continental Restoration out of Fort Scott Kansas. Since the Theatre is listed on the National Register, we took this item to the Heritage Commission who approved the tuck pointing and brick replacement. The Heritage Commission had approved the cornice repair at the School of Music Building last fall. Mid-Continental has a good track record in Salina and elsewhere. They have repaired the masonry at the Masonic Temple and at the First United Methodist Church. You'll probably see their equipment down there a few more weeks. The repair won't extend to the tower at this time. It is mainly to repair water intrusion at the coping. Also, the Planning Department received a demolition permit application for the canopy at 112-118 S. Santa Fe. The building owner had requested to do a limited demolition first to determine what sort of structure was behind the canopy and supports before they provide us with a design for the replacement awning. We allowed this at Martha and David. Staff approved the demolition administratively in order for their contractor to verify the structure at the upper storefront. They have removed a portion of the canopy at 118 S. Santa Fe. This is informative.

Ms. Perney stated I have noticed that work.

Ms. Klima stated I wanted to come in today to talk to you and staff concerning the Ordinance proposal that you reviewed a couple of years ago that included a design review matrix. I'm fairly new here and I haven't determined what has happened to that proposal. I wanted to get the Board's position on the matrix and how we as staff and our constituents can know when they have to appear before this Board. I need to know how to direct them to that whole process.

Ms. Perney stated that the matrix is probably still on Mr. Bengtson's desk.

Mr. Burger stated the matrix was part of a design review procedure that allowed staff to review some types of minor projects. The matrix detailed the types of projects that would come to you for the Board's review. I would be glad to furnish Board members with the draft that was approved by this Board, the BID Advisors and the City Commission in May 2006. The Ordinance amendment proposed by the BID did not progress past second reading by the City Commission and was never adopted.

Ms. Perney stated its part of a bigger package that I won't call an ordinance. The amendment went to the City Commission and while they initially approved it, they pulled it off before second reading. That has been about a year and a half ago. The matrix is part of that, but basically allows administrative staff to review some minor items that wouldn't merit a formal review by this Board. John, could you get a copy of the matrix to Phyll.

Mr. Burger stated I would be glad to get Phyll a copy. What did fail to be approved was an Ordinance amendment that would have provided more clear and precise design criteria than the five findings that are in the Ordinance today. When the Ordinance amendment failed to be approved, the matrix was part of that proposal, so it was never used. We relied on the existing Ordinance to determine what staff reviewed and that was projects involving less than a \$1,000 cost, did not involve a structural change or Building or Sign Permit. That is where it is today. We have talked as Planning staff to strengthen the 1995 Downtown Design Guidelines and to use those to establish findings for the Design Review Board to utilize for their review. That could be done without amending the Ordinance. I'd be glad to provide Phyll a copy of the matrix and the background material.

Ms. Perney stated we do have new members on this Board who may not be familiar with all that has transpired regarding this. Would it be possible to get a copy of the matrix and Ordinance amendment to our Board members? I know that Eloise does not have a copy. Mike and John don't have a copy either. It would help them to understand what we have been talking about instead of just putting it on the shelf.

Mr. Burger stated that wouldn't be a problem. They will receive a copy of the design review matrix before our next meeting.

Ms. Perney stated I think that would be helpful too. It will have a copy of the matrix and it will become clear for everybody on the Board regarding what was the whole package.

Mr. Burger stated that we will distribute that.

6. The next meeting, if scheduled, will be on May 31, 2007.

Design Review Board Minutes May 24, 2007 Page 8

Mr. Burger stated that we do not have any applications to bring to you on May 31<sup>st</sup>. That meeting date can conflict with Memorial Day Holiday travel so we try to avoid it. As we have applications over the summer, we would appreciate Design Review Board members confirming with us whether they will or will not be in town to attend a scheduled meeting. This would be a courtesy to our applicants. We do not want to hold a meeting unless we can obtain a quorum of members. We do have an application to bring to you on June 14<sup>th</sup> so that is our next meeting date.

# 7. A motion to adjourn is in order.

Ms. Perney adjourned the meeting the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

John Burger, Assistant Secretary

Attest: